

LETTER

To the Honourable

Sir ROBERT HOWARD,

Occasioned by a late Book, Entituled,

A Two-fold Vindication

Of the late Archbishop of

CANTERBURY,

And of the Author of the

History of Religion.

By AL. MONRO, D.D.

L O N D O N,

Printed for E. Whitlock near Stationers-hall, 1696.

ERRATA.

PAge 4. line 4. for *this* r. *that* p. 6. l. 21. r. elegancies p. 7. l. 8. r. accent. ibid l. 15. r. Philosopher p. 8. l. 12. for *to* r. *in* ibid. l. ult. for innocence r. *innoscence* p. 9. l. 4. r. *innoscence* ibid l. 9. r. *innoscence* ibid l. 29. r. highlander p. 10. l. 7. r. *Cameron* ibid. l. 10. after *more* add *of* ibid. l. 19. for *used* r. *and* p. 12. l. 14. for *Socinianism* r. *Socinians* p. 13. l. 13. r. *innoscence* p. 16. l. 21. for *Sixth* r. *Sixteenth* p. 18. l. 11. after *there* add *are* p. 20. l. ult. r. Hero's p. 23. l. 29. r. Diminutive p. 26. l. 16. r. title.

S I R,

I Received your Answer to my Letter dated the 13th of April last, and I thank you heartily for your civility. In mine I gave you a short Account of the barbarous Treatment I met with, in a Book Entituled, *A Twofold Vindication of the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and of the Author of the History of Religion*. I presum'd to address my complaint to your self, because you was pleas'd to prefix an Epistle to that Book, in which I am expos'd with greater contempt and severity than I deserve at your hands.

I humbly suppose you proceeded upon the same Mistakes and malicious Informations, that provok'd your two *Anonymous* Authors to so much Fury and Indignation. The ground of their quarrel is, that they take it for granted, that I am the Author of a certain Pamphlet Entituled, *The Charge of Socinianism against Dr. Tillotson considered*. This is the second time that I have been rudely and publicly accus'd on this very Head. I might reasonably expect, that your *Two Philosophers* would more narrowly examine the Matter of *Fact*, before they had abus'd an innocent Stranger in so scurrilous a manner; they are such as left me no opportunity to know their Names, or the place of their Residence: Nor am I now at liberty to make a stricter search where those Birds of darkness may be seen. We know without the Assistance of a Revelation, *that he that doth evil hateth the Light*.

The Advertisement, which I printed in the Month of *January* last, in opposition to the Censures publish'd against me, upon the foot of that Calumny, might (one may reasonably think) cover me from all Libels of that Nature, since I am ready to take my Oath, before any Judge, that I never had the least thought of writing any such Book, as *the Charge of Socinianism*, &c. in any former moment of my life: And so far from writing any Animadversions on your *History of Religion*, that I never saw it until the 16th of *April*, 1696.

It may be, that your two Champions will impute this second Vindication to my fear and pusillanimity, and say, that I am some timorous and silly Creature, I dare not now avow what I have foolishly done: I am so lash'd, that it is not fit to write any more, to provoke the Anger of such terrible Men, whose greatest Talent is calumny and impertinence. Nevertheless, I may venture to tell you, (hoping that your passions are more calm,) that I can prove, to a demonstration, by Witnesses of more unstain'd Authority and Reputation than any of my Accusers, that another is the true and sole Author of that Book: And perhaps he may, in due time, discover himself, if he can be secur'd against those Inconveniencies which may probably follow upon his being known. When *your very learn'd Authors* consider this, it may mortifie their accurate Wisdom, to have thrown away all their Amunition of Wit and Raillery before they discover'd their Enemy. And now, Sir, I beg your pardon, if I have not the same opinion of their *Morals*, that you have of their *Intellectuals*. To rob a Man of his good Name maliciously, and without any certainty of matter of *Fact*, can as little be reconcil'd to the Rules of Honour as to the common Measures of Justice. The

The first of them endeavours (all he can) to represent me a Beast. The next makes me a Devil, tho' one of the weakest and silliest Orders. 'Tis happy for the Prisoner at the Bar when the *Evidences* contradict one another. However between them two I make a very sad figure. I am not now to entertain you with my thoughts of their Learning and Theology; they may Write or refute what Books they please: 'Tis time for me to interpose when they meddle with anything that is truly mine. I arrogate to my self no man's performances. As for the the Book, that they seem to tear in pieces with so much bitterness and violence, I only read some few pages in it; And the Gentleman who gave me a Copy is ready to take his Oath, that, upon the delivery of the Book, I said to him, that I should never be able to read it to the end, it was printed in so small a Character.

It is not enough for your two *Philosophers* to fall upon me like Madmen, and to abuse me for what is contain'd in the Book, but they must needs drop some Reflections that they think are peculiar either to my Person or my Country. If they had confin'd their Libels to the *subject matter*, I would Judge it no part of my business to undeceive them: But when they make use of *Arguments* and *Critical Observations*, to prove that I am the Author of such a Book, their Reasons are so short and superficial that I may be allow'd to examine them. The first says, pag. 33. that I was *not able to keep my own Secret*, but that it got abroad among a great many, that I was the Man, that thought my self qualified to *censure the Doctrine of an Archbishop of Canterbury*, and to encounter with the great Author of the *History of Religion*.

This

This is impudence with a witness. Did I say so to himself, or to any other Trifling Calumniator? Is it not reasonable for him to let me know who this Gentleman is to whom I said anything of this Nature? But this fair and ingenuous Dealing is not his way; it is enough for him that he was inform'd by some little Whisperer that I was the Author of such a Book. And *your Philosopher* thought this a sufficient proof; he was glad any Man was nam'd, on whom he might so safely discharge his fury. But when he found it was some *same Illiterate Pedant*, then he puts himself all in Armour, as all Cowards do, where there is no danger. If I confess'd the matter of *fact* my self it is in vain to contradict it. In the mean time I presume to tell you, that whether he spoke this of himself, or whether he was prompted by others, that he is in the Strictest sense a Calumniator and a Liar. I confess these words are harsh, and are not ordinarily heard in the Conversation of Gentlemen. But if any thing can provoke this Impertinent Accuser to do himself Justice, I think it may warm him into some generous behaviour, to be so represented to his Great Patron. If he patiently endure the Character of a Liar, I do not envy him the honour of his invention; if not, he will let me know who was his Informer, as in justice and common sense he is oblig'd to do. And this is not answer'd by Writing of Pamphlets, and gathering together several incoherent Stories and Probabilities, but by an ingenuous acknowledgment of his willfull and unaccountable Forgery; for when he re-examines his *Evidence*, he will discover his own Precipitation and rashness. I gave occasion to no such Calumny, no not by the least inadvertence or indiscretion: And it is very hard to oblige me at this time

time of day to the Drudgery of Vindicating my self from Infamous Libels.

You say in your Preface, that they are *two very Learned Men*. Men may be *mad* without *too much Learning* : I wish their civility and good breeding had been equal to their Learning. Nor is it a pin matter to me how Learn'd they are : I am sure they are very Impertinent to Libel a Man, upon the Publick Theatre of the Nation, to whom they are as great Strangers in all Regards (either as to his life or accomplishments) as I am to the Emperor of Morocco.

However, as far as I am concern'd, it is needless to baulk any of their *Arguments*. The question between me and your *two very Learn'd Gentlemen* is not any Common Place of *Theology*, but a matter of *fact*. I let pass all their Virulent Reproaches, that seem to be occasioned by the Book that they undertake to refute.

The first *Argument* to prove me the Author of it is, that *I did not keep my own Secret*. Of this you very kindly put me in mind in your Letter, dated the 13th. of April. But how does he prove this? Very well, after his way ; He says, that it got abroad among many People, that *I thought my self qualified for such an Undertaking*. Does it become a Man that sets up for an Accurate Philosopher to proceed upon *whisper*, *Hear-say*, and *surmise*, to the ruine of his Neighbour's honour and reputation. Was not he obliged to give the World a plain account of the *Authority* and *honesty* of him, upon whose testimony he built his *Defamatory Libel*. He must needs know, that a Malicious inconsiderate Liar sets thousands of People by the Ears every moment, especially such Informers

as may be reasonably supposed our two Authors have conversed with. They heard such a thing, and there was no more necessary in their opinion to make one the Author of such a Pamphlet. But if a Report of this nature can bear the Superstructure of such a calumny, Men might have nothing else to do than to Write *Vindications*; they must run from one corner to another, without intermission, to publish their Defences and Apologies against every Rude and Impertinent Libel. The Philosophers advise us to be slow and wary in Drawing Consequences; yet, it seems, they have lost all their pains upon your two Precipitate Authors. We ought to treat no Man otherwise than the Golden Rule of our Blessed Saviour allows; *Quod tibi fieri non vis*, &c. There is nothing so Treacherous or fails a Man sooner than a transient Whissing report;

Tam ficti pravique tenax quam Nuncia Veri.

But perhaps the next *Argument* is more *Conclusive* and *Solid*. He is very sure the Author is a *Scot*, because for positive he always writes positive. To this he adds some Elegencies, or rather Improproprieties that he thinks are peculiar to the Scots, viz: *The Men above-told, the Reason above-told*. And again; *it makes all my flesh to creep*.

From these he concludes the Author not only to be *Scot*, but a *Highlander*. Now, upon supposition that these were *Idioms* of the *Scotish* Dialect, his ridiculous conjecture would scarcely make up a probable Argument, if there was but one Scots-man in the Isle of *Britain*: But when there are so many thousands of them, his guesses vanish into a Dream, and proves that there are greater flaws in his reasoning faculty,

faculty, than there are Improperities in the *Scottish* Dialect. May not those Forreigners, who learn to speak *English*, put their own *Idiotisms* in *English* words? Are there not some *English* that frequently converse with those, as well as with the *Scots*? Are there not several Counties in the Northern parts of *England*, that differ in their Phrase as well as in their Account from those in *Kent*, and *Middlesex*? Are there not some other People in the World, besides the *Scots*, who have different Phrases and *Idioms* from the *English*? And have not they also a dependence upon the Monarch of *Great Britain*, as well as the *Scots*? and this may oblige them frequently to reside in or about the City of *London*.

Let our very learn'd Philosophers view his own Argument again; he may easily find he hath not been so slow and cautious in drawing his Consequences as he ought to be. Are there not some *English-men*, that, for reasons best known to themselves, *now* and *then* make use of *Scottish* Phrases? If any of these suppositions hold true, his *Argument*, to prove me the Author of such a Book, is the most precarious, weak, incoherent Conjecture that ever dropt from a Man's Pen.

But, Sir *Robert*, I have more to say to this Argument, it is this; that one of your Authors takes those words to be *Idioms* of the *Scottish* Dialect, which no *Scotch-man* ever heard of: For my part, neither in their Writings nor Conversation did I ever remark any such Phrases, as he sets down for Arguments, to prove his Author to be a *Scotch-man*; such as these, *the Stan above told*, *the reason above told*. And the difference between the *Scottish* and the *English* Language, is not in those imaginary *Improperities*, that he fancies may di-

distinguish the first from the last, but rather in this, that We of *Scotland*, (besides a different Accent) retain a great many of the Old *Saxon* words, which are not now us'd in *England*: But they that understand the *English* Language accurately, understand also those *Saxon* words, some of which may be met with, in the Old Version of the *Psalms*, daily read in the Churches. And if he be so squeamish as not to read that Version of the *Psalms*; he may read *Milton's* Poems, and *Chaucer's* Works, where he may see many of those words that distinguish the *Scottish* Idiom, from that which is now us'd in *England*. The difference is not to the misplacing of words, but in the Phrase it self, the first may proceed from the inadvertence of an Author, either *Scottish* or *English*: And it is a very bad Argument to prove that the Author of such a Book is not an *English-man*, if I meet with an unusual word, or an *impropriety* in his compositions. There is no fixt true Standard for the *English* Language, and therefore every day we see new Words, as new Books do appear; and several of them so harsh in the sound, and so little us'd, that immediately they vanish unto their former darkness and solitude. Thus have I read in a late Book the word (*impunibly*) (and in a Book written against *Mysteries* too.) But I suppose no Man will reasonably conclude, that the Author was either *Scot* or *English*, only from this unusual word.

To come a little nearer: If I might venture to reason, as *your Philosophers* seems to do, I would prove that the Author of the *History of Religion* is not an *English-man*; for in the 96th Page, I meet with a word which very few *English-men* know or ever heard; for there the Author says, that the *mistakes and opinions which proceed from innocence* do not make Men guilty,

guilty, that is to say, from their *weakness* and *ignorance*.

How much *weakness* and *ignorance* there may be imply'd in the word (*innocence*) I cannot tell; it may have in it all the Mysteries of * *Abracadabra*, for any thing I know; for I never read it before. Nor do I admire the word (*Impersonation*) in the Author of the *Charge of Socinianism*, no more than I do the word (*Innocence*) both of them want Authority and Custom, to preserve them from being banish'd out of ordinary Conversation.

* Vid. Seld. de Euf.
Syria.

Perhaps your Author built his Confidence, not so much upon the strength of his critical Remarks, as upon the Authority of his Informer; yet, to mortifie him and his cholerick Neighbour; I may be allow'd to tell you, that the Author of the Book, Entitled, *The Charge of Socinianism* against Dr. Tillotson, was never in *Scotland*; so far from being beyond the River of *Tay*, that he never was on the other side of *Tweed*, nor any City or Village in that Ancient Kingdom.

One of your Authors tells us, (speaking of Mr. *Atterbury*) that *Students* do not hold themselves oblig'd to reason accurately and closely, as other (common) Men must, but, by leaping over some intervening suitable Propositions, may skip from Tumult to King *Pipin*; or, what is as good, from *Historian* to *Scorner*.

One would think, that the distance between an unusual Phrase, and a *Scotch-Highland*, is as wide as that between *Tumult* and *King Pipin*; or that between an *Historian* and a *Scorner*. I see, that *Students* are not the only Men that reason loosely, and incoherently; there are other Sparks who pretend to digest nothing but *Self-evident Propositions*, and accurate Infallible Dedu-

ctions from *clear Premises*; and *they* sometimes mistake the Mark as much as the former, who are said to owe their false reasonings to *dark keeping*, and other Intelicities of their Education. I cannot perceive how the *Highlander* was forced to make up the Comical part of the Book.

Vid. Preface of the
Two-fold Vindict.

I suppose *Buchanan* and *Cameron* were greater Critics than the *two Philosophers*; and they were both of them *Scotch-Highlanders*. But when I consider the *petulance* and *temper* of our Authors; I am afraid, the naming of any of our Country-men, to remove *their* Mistakes, may savour more *meanness* than *Condescension*.

His observation that *the flesh of a Highlander creeps*, is as *New* to me as the *Phrase*: I am sure, there are several of them, that he thus Lampoons, would be very apt to make *his* Flesh tremble, if they knew him, and that withal he continued obstinate in his scurrilous rudeness. National Reproaches make up the divertisement used Witticisms of *Porter's* and *Buffoon's*. I know no Country but may boast of its *Heroes* and *Excellent Men*; And they, who are forward to make comparisons, are never reckoned into the number; *they* are Knights of a lower Order, such as pass all their *Campaigns* in Taverns and other places not fit to be named. In these, there may be dangers; but, I humbly suppose, very little Honour.

'Tis true, our Soil is not so fertil as the more Southern parts of the Island: Our Sun seems to be sick for several Months in the Year; nevertheless, the common Character of the *Scot's præ fervidum Scotorum Ingenium*, may be thought (generally speaking) more true than that which he is pleased to bestow upon his imaginary Adversary, Viz. *That his Northern frozen head*

head could not perceive the Socinian subtilties. I thought they were a Sect that pretended to advance nothing (nay, allow of nothing) but plain and undisputable Propositions ; that *they* were so slow and cautious in drawing Consequences, that nothing short of Mathematical Evidence could satisfy them : And when I was reading the Book that occasioned this Letter, I meet with the following words ; *For as to report and the whispers of those Sagacious Men, who so certainly know all Authors, they are so oft mistaken, that, except it be here and there a Student, no body heed them; or rather every body abhors them.*

Yet, this very sagacious *Philosopher* ; this very Man of Evidence and *Demonstration*, without any other proof, than a slender Whisper or an *Impudent* lye, finds out *all Authors*, and knows them exactly, as if he had been conversant with them from their Infancy. But if his Conjecture stumble upon a Highlander, then such a contemptible Creature must be crush'd to death. But Men of valour use not to draw their Swords at so a great distance, they approach their Enemy with less noise : and they that pretend to Philosophy trust more to their Arguments than to their Fury and Indignation. It is certainly so and so as he concludes ; it can be no other than such a one ; there are *Improprieties* in the Book, and none else could be guilty of them but that one Man ; and then, by such accurate reasoning, his *creeping witticism* must get abroad. I would advise this unknown Gentleman once more to consult the trifling *Inform*er that gave him his intelligence, and ask him but a few plain questions, *viz.* Whether he had his information from me ? Whether he himself is familiarly acquainted with me ? Whether, after all he be a Man

Man of any Honour or Justice? Whether he is resolved to appear to make good the Charge? One may reasonably presume, that a *very Learned Author* would not be so *very* Confident, unless the Authorities, that he built upon, were strong enough to support the weight of his Insolence and Buffoonry.

The next Author treats me with the same virulence and contempt that the former does; but he may appear, even to himself, a very ridiculous Fellow, that, with so much wit, undertakes the defence of such particular Propositions as I my self lately proved (I hope plainly enough) against another tribe very different from the *Socinianism*, in a small Treatise entitled, *An Enquiry into the New Opinions*, Printed for *Walter Kestilby* at the *Bishop's-head* in *St. Paul's Church-yard*. And this Book appeared, with my name, a considerable time before his scurrilous Libel was Printed. I instance but in one particular, which I advance in that *Essay*, and it is this; that our *Blessed Saviour* complied with those *Rituals* in the Worship of God among the *Jews*, which had their *Rise* and *Original* only from human *Authority*: Nay, I think the Opposite Doctrine, that allows of nothing in the Solemnities of Worship, but what is founded upon *express* Divine *Institution*, to be the source of all *Bigottry* and *Enthusiasm*. God is to be Worshiped, and *that* in *Unity* and *Society*. If this be allowed, several *Rites* and *Ceremonies* must be Practis'd and enjoin'd, which have no Institution but in the Prudence and determination of our Superiours. If the angry Gentleman read this little Book that I have named, he may *then* be more able to pass his *Decretory* Sentence, how far the Contemptible Professor is of *Mr. Knox's* Principles. He

or his Neighbour, (I do not now remember which of the two) not only lashes me as being tainted with those Principles of Sedition and Confusion, that were so warmly Propagated by *Mr. Knox*, but he says, that all the Episcopal Clergy of *Scotland*, tho' they forsook *Mr. Calvin* and *Mr. Knox* in the question about Church Government, yet, in points of Doctrine, they have varied nothing at all from *Mr. Knox* Author of the Reformation there.

If this Man's knowledge in *Theology* was equal to his skill in our *History*, he would certainly make the saddest figure that ever appear'd, that is to say, he would be all over *Innocence* in its true *Original* and *Insignificant Notion*, so much below a *Cypher* that there is no Room left for him in *Arithmetick*. Therefore he may be advised to let the Clergy of *Scotland* and their Doctrine alone; they are not yet so low, after all the oppressions and contradictions of sinners that they have endured, as to want an Apology against the Railings of an inconsiderate Calumniator, who knows as little the Persons, that he thus bespatters, as he does the Author of the *Charge of Socinianism*, &c. Let him read *Dr. Forbes* Bishop of *Edinbourg* his *Considerationes Modestæ*, and then let him tell me whether he was in all points of Doctrine of *Mr. Calvin* or *Mr. Knox's* Sentiments: And he was a Person whose Character and Learning was more likely to make Disciples amongst the Clergy of *Scotland*, than the two Reformers that he is pleas'd to name. Nevertheless, *Calvin* ought to be mention'd with honour, because of the purity of his stile, and other extraordinary accomplishments.

Some of our Clergy may have their differences amongst themselves about the Doctrine of *Predestina-*

n. and *Freewill*, but then this is no reproach peculiar to *Scotland*; these are *Common Places* in *Divinity* that divide (not Churches from Churches but) Men from Men. Those questions have been disputed in all Ages, and will remain dark to the end of the World, even to the *Socinians* themselves, who pretend to banish all *mysteries*. I believe the Infinite Incomprehensible Power of God, and that he is the first cause of all things; in *him we live, move, and have our Being*. I believe him also *infinitely Good*, and that he loves us better than we can do ourselves, and that he governs the World by Laws just, holy, and excellent. I Worship him under this *Idea* of Original Goodness and Power; and I am very sure, that none of the *true* and *necessary deductions*, from these two great *Attributes*, can be at variance with one another. If I, (who am but Dust and Ashes,) neither can see, nor happily explain their agreement in all *Minute* instances, it is my Ignorance and Weakness. The Good I do is from God, the Evil altogether from my self: And this is a short Confession of what I think all Men ought to adhere to, in those intricate and abstruse questions of *Predestination* and *Freewill*.

I am not now inclin'd to enter into any particular disquisition concerning the Original of Sacrifices; nor had I ever the least thought of writing Animadversions on any Sermons Publish'd by the Late Archbishop *Tillotson*; most of them as were Printed before the Revolution I read with great satisfaction; and those that since appear'd I only read some of them, as I met with them accidentally in the Booksellers-shops, being not in an humour to buy New Books, when I knew not how long I could keep such as I had formerly purchased.

Then

Then your Philosopher recommends to me that I should read *Spencer* and *Ontram*. I love him the better that he converses with such Authors, who are as much above the *Common Level* of *Systematick Writers* as *their Learning exceeds his own modesty and good nature*.

The former Author draws a Picture of me in little. I am not concern'd much to view it, tho' the *Lineaments* and *Features* had been more true; but as they are extremely ugly and extravagantly false, he may lay it up in his own Closet, to entertain himself with it, when he is in his *Hypochondriack* fits. The first strokes of his *Tableau* are Historical, and terminate only in my Person; and such as the Author of the *Charge of Socinianism* is not at all concern'd in. In the mean time, I think my self oblig'd to give him no account of any part of my life, unless I knew him better. And if I did, perhaps I might still continue in the same resolution. He accuses me to have charged the late Archbishop of Canterbury, and the Bishop of Sarum, and the Author of the *History of Religion of Socinianism*: And he adds this most accurate Reason, because I mistake the Doctrine of the Church and the Arguments she useth for the Socinian Doctrine and Reasons.

Whether any of those Gentlemen now named were, or are Socinians, is more than ever I intend to enquire. It is a very new thing to me to hear that the Church useth Arguments for the Socinian Doctrine and Reasons.

It is true; one of his eminent Authors accused me of being the Author of the *Charge of Socinianism*, in the Month of December last; a mercenary malice and profound ignorance were but some of

Vid. Vind. of the Bishop of Sarum's Charge for Mr. Chiswel. pag. 105 106.

the vertues he allowed me, and heartily forgive him those precipitate ramblings but have suffered since that time some things more terrible than the disdainful strokes of *Mr Perle*, I am apt to think that his Credulity led him into this mistake. It is the unhappy lot of most, who are advanced to *Eminent Stations*, to be haunted with *Sycophants, false Accusers, Liars,* and *Talebearers*. If they guard against the malignity of such Vermin, their Vertue is more than ordinary; and if they do not hear with both their ears they are certain plagues to human Society.

But one of the most surprising and impertinent strokes of your Author's Libel is, that he charges me to have *accus'd your self of ingratitude to King James*; for I never heard of your name until this Book was put into my hands, by one of my Friends. And I am as much qualified to write the lives of all the *Irish Kings* before the Conquest, as I am to give any tolerable account of any part of your self. As for your Book entitled *The History of the Nation* I never saw it until the 6th of April 1690. So far have I been from writing any Affirmations upon it. And if I did, they should be very short. And I had rather communicate them to your self, than print against an Author that I have not the honour to be acquainted with. The Book seems to be designed against *Priest-craft, Persecution,* and *hypocrisy*. The word (*Priest-craft*) is of late become very fashionable in the mouths of some, who are no great *Patterns* for Philosophical Gentlemen to imitate. It by *Priest-craft* is intended the sacred employment of a certain Order of Men, who by their Office and Character, are oblig'd to superintend the Solemnities of Publick Worship. Such Men are no less necessary to the *Preservation* of the State than to the *Administra-*

tions

ties of Religion. And the Persons so employ'd, (even
 in the most abject of Interest and Reputation) are
 too strong to be attacked by any private Gentleman
 in Europe. I argue now from what is *present* and
visible, and not from the more divine and excellent
 considerations of Religion; because, what is felt and
 seen, is, much more valued and respected, than the
 Original Distinction between Good and Evil, or what
 may be pleaded from the terrors of an invisible State.
 I confess the Argument is not so *philosophical* and *sub-
 lime*; but it is such a one as now offers to your own
 consideration how far it ought to regulate the Practice
 of any Man, who lives in a Nation, where the
 Priests are so able to affect; from the best *Traditions*; their
Distinctions and *Character*; and the Priesthood it self is
 guarded by so many Laws, and so many *Antiquities*.
 As for *Persecution*, I'll hope, I am as much an enemy
 to it as any other in the World. But since *Conscience*
 may be *persecuted*, when *faction* and *sedition* are in-
 tended, I think the State may be left to judge for it
 self in all things relating to its own preservation; and
 therefore the Good Laws, that have been made, to
 preserve the *Beauty* and *Order* of God's House; may be
reasonably and *charitably* put in execution to prevent
 such Confusions as must needs follow, where *Gillie-
 ness* and *Enthusiasm* are uppermost. We may suffer
 hard things from Ecclesiastical Laws that are severe;
 but human nature it self, common sense, and civi-
 lity are banish'd where a Boundless *Scepticism* pre-
 vails. It is to die to *Arbitrary Power* is most frequently de-
 claimed against by such as are invested with no Power: But it is
 very hard to oblige the *Sovereign Powers* of the World
 to give an account of all their Actions; and if they

did, the Body of the People can never perceive the Reasonableness of what they do, even when their measures are most Divine and unquestionably just. If I should say that I know no reason why I am committed to the *Gate-house*, I would be thought very Impertinent, tho' I should stumble upon the truth. No Governors are oblig'd to let every body know what they do at all times.

If there are mysteries in the Government of the World, it may be more reasonably presum'd that that there mysteries in Religion which we ought to believe, tho' we can never fully grasp nor comprehend them. When Men have done their best, there is some thing dark in the object of Faith. If we have good reason to believe, that the Revelation, which contains the Articles of our Religion, proceeds originally from God, and that we do not mistake the plain signification of those Words, in which it is convey'd, we may, with the greater safety, believe that *such* and *such* Propositions are true, tho' they be above the *comprehension* of our Reason. We cannot say, that we fully understand the *Essence* of any the least *Created* being, far less the *Infinite* and *Eternal* Mind, who made the World and governs it. We believe, that his power is beyond our thoughts and *Incomprehensible*; but can any Man confidently say, that he himself has a full and *adequate Idea* of what is *Infinite* or *Incomprehensible*?

Sir, I have kept you too long on this subject. I would humbly intreat either or both of the two Calumniators to be a little more wary in their Libels. 'Tis an easy thing for them to put it to a fair Trial whether I can read *Greek* or *Latin*, or whether *either* of them can Speak any other Language than
what

what his Mother taught him. As for the reflexions
thrown upon the Universities of Scotland; those So-
cieties are above the Censures of an unknown Trifler:
his tongue is an *Urruly Evil*, it is full
of *Deadly Poison*. I cannot tell how
oft he blesses God with it; his greatest
talent is to *surse Men made after the Similitude of*
God.

One of them recommends to me two very good
Books; and I thank him for his kindness. I think,
he himself had need to read over again *Crellius Ethicks*;
And if that be troublesome, he may cast his eye
upon a most excellent Sermon against *Evil-speaking*,
Published by one of his *eminent Authors*. And now,
Sir; your two Philosophers may ask one another,
whether they know the Person they have so impu-
dently Calumniated? Whether the Authority
they proceeded upon be so firm as to bear the
weight of their notorious Forgeries and Lies? Whether
ever they heard that there was any Pro-
fessor in any University of Scotland at any time,
since their first foundation, so ignorant as they re-
present me to be. But if they built their Calumnious
stories upon the Authority of one of their *Eminent*
Bishops, I may be allow'd to tell them, that I was
already at some pains, in the Month of *January* last,
to undeceive their Author as to this Calumny. Then
there was a Libel Published against me; and it
seems it was below his *Eminence* to retract an injury
he had done to so mean a Person. It is much more
easy eloquently to extol the *Morals* of Christianity;
than to practise self-denial and humility: Pride, Po-
pular Applause, and Vanity do animate Men to the
first; but nothing short of a profound Resignation
to

to the will of our Blessed Saviour, can enable us to
 praise the latter. ^{as to sinners} I sh^d now know
 to take it for granted that my greatest sufferer is
 now convinced, that I never wrote any such Book
 as *the Charge of Sorinianism, &c.* I Yet, because the
 same Libel is again Propagated by the industry and
 malice of two unknown Slanders, I think it fit to
 subjoin to this Letter the Advertisement, that I was
 forced, (some Months ago) to Publish in my own
 Defence. And he that reads the
 Bishop's Vindication, Printed for
 Mr. Chiswel in St. Paul's Church-yard, may easily un-
 derstand what is either express'd or insinuated in the
 following Paper. There are some words in it which
 might have been spar'd, but if compar'd with the
 Character bestow'd upon me, perhaps many more
 might have been added, without any Censure from
 the Impartial World. If the open injustice, that I
 met with, made me then so free, the peevishness,
 which may be occasioned by imprisonment, may ex-
 tenuate the Reprinting of it; since the Loads of Re-
 proach thrown upon me, by your two scurrilous Cham-
 pions, are but some Larger Annotations on the Ori-
 ginal Character, in which I was then represented
 in such taking colours to the view of the Nation.

Sir, I now make an end of this Letter, and I
 presume to ask but the same question that I humbly
 desired you formerly to consider, namely, what re-
 parations you think are due to an innocent Stranger
 so unworthily abused. I forbear to aggravate the
 Injustice that is done to me in your Preface, as well
 as in the other parts of the Book, for I believe you
 wrote it carelessly, and you thought that your two
Heroes were as infallible in their censures, as they ap-
 pear'd

dear to you accurate in their Reasonings. I heartily
forgive you, and I wish you may be, for the time
to come, more critically nice in examining those Re-
ports that have no other beginning than *Malice, Non-
sense, and Impertinence.* Sir, I am in all Sincerity and
due respect,

Your very humble Servant,

A. MONRO.

places of Reviling, which only proves, That the Au-
thor was very angry. One may venture to draw this
consequence from what is said page 107. and 108.

THE following Advertisement was Printed in
the Month of January last, to undeceive such
as might be imposed upon by those Libels, which then
charged me with the same Calumny that is now suffi-
ciently removed by this, *Letter.*

The Rules of Humanity obliges us to more
Compassion and good Nature: But most Men had
rather talk of Generosity than practice it.

AN ADVERTISEMENT

By A. M. D. 1727.

Whereas it hath been talked by some idle and
impertinent People, that I am the Author
of a certain Book, entituled, *The Charge of Socinian-
ism against Doctor Tillotson, &c.* I think it fit to
declare, that I never was the Author of any such
Book, charging him or any other with Socinianism.
And I further declare, That I was never enticed,
prompted, or encouraged by any Man (dead or alive)

to write any thing of ~~that~~ nature. And I am ready to take my Oath, in the most solemn manner, to confirm the truth of all this, if duly required thereunto.

When I have said so much, I think I am but little concerned to answer any Libel intended against me upon this occasion, in which I am sensibly struck at, by some distinguishing *innuendoes*, (tho' not particularly named,) as the Vindicator himself acknowledges. The several reflections, in a short digression of a late Book, levelled at me, are but some common places of Reviling, which only proves, That the Author was very angry. One may venture to draw this Consequence from what is said Page 105. and 106. of his Vindication, without the imputation of either Ignorance or Malice. No modest Man loves to be put upon the unpleasant Task of defending himself against Reproaches of this Nature. It is barbarous to invade a Man's good Name, upon slender and foolish Surmises. The Rules of Humanity oblige us to more Compassion and good Nature: But most Men had rather talk of Generosity than practise it. If we truly understood the Precepts of Natural Religion, we would be the more prepared heartily to believe that which is Revealed.

It is a great Infelicity to continue for any considerable time, under the dominion of a brutal Passion: And it is very difficult to hide it, where once it hath got the *Ascendant*. Art and Memory may give a Man the slip, and Nature will appear in its own Colours. It is uneasy to act a Part, even when we are much accustom'd to it. I thank God, I was never made a Tool to serve the Passions or Interests of any particular Man or Party: I still retain the liberty of
my

my Thoughts and Actions under all my Disasters. If I am oblig'd to my Friends, I am resolv'd to be Grateful: I am very sure, none of them gave my Enemies any Commission to upbraid me with *their* kindnesses. *Cruel Mockings* do ordinarily attend the State of the Oppress'd: And Philosophy, as well as Justice has deserted the Earth. What *St. Paul* hath said of the Primitive Christians is, in a peculiar manner, true of the Clergy of *Scotland*, if there be not another Life, *They are of all Men the most miserable*. I pray God they may possess their Souls in patience.

For my part, I love my Solitude and Retirement; and the oldest Books in Divinity better than all the later Essays and Explications. When *my Ecclesiastical Superiors* inform me, That my endeavours to serve the Church, are impertinent or unseasonable, I cheerfully submit to their Authority, as I have always done, in *their* and my) more prosperous Circumstances.

What is observ'd by my Accuser is certainly true, *viz. That some Men have an Art of writing to disparage the side they write for*. For this very reason, some hasty Productions have been committed to the Flames, and others, which perhaps deserve the same Illuminations, are suppress'd.

If he had left me half dead under the Cloud of general Strictures, there might be some hopes of a Resurrection; but he thought it convenient to set me in a better Light: I must be ferreted from one *Dominative* unto another, until the Multitude fix their Eyes upon me. A Triumphal Arch must be rais'd, where such a contemptible Creature was slain; and therefore he adds, *That it is probable, the Party will desire their Journey-man to forbear writing, and*

D

reserve

reserve himself for Fighting, in which he is better
practis'd.

One that reads this last stroak may be made to believe, that some time or other I have fall'n into Quarrels and Contentions, very unbecoming a Presbyter, whereas the true story, that is thus disguis'd into an Invektive, is no more, than that I was perswaded by a Relation of mine (then Lieutenant-Colonel to my Lord Dumbarton's Regiment) when I was very Young, to go abroad with him: I complied with his Invitation: I stayed in France about two Years and a half: And tho' I was List'd in that Regiment, I was under no restraints that might divert me from any part of Learning that I had a mind to: That Scene was quickly over; I return'd to my own Country and former Studies. This innocent excursion of my Life made up a part of the *Presbyterian Libel at Edinbrough, Anno 1690.* and it appears I then so ridiculous, that I thought it should never be reviv'd again by any Man thereafter.

To have been a Souldier, is a Reproach only in the Opinion of some few Men, who understand Libelling better than the discipline of War. The Greatest in all Ages thought, that the Liberal Sciences, and the knowledge of Arms are not at such odds with one another. *Julius Scaliger* and *Monsieur Des Cartes*, (to name no more) were Soldiers. The truth is, I am not ambitious of being call'd a *Journey-man*: And I am surpris'd to find so mean a World plac'd so near another, that is so usual and so many. Some Men forget nothing but the *Decorum* due to their Character: It is fitter for such to give hard Names, than for me to return an Answer. Notwithstanding of all this, I thank God, I was never oblig'd nor inclined

to Fight, nor yet engaged in any *Rencontre* that could make me incapable to lerve at the Altar.

It is no part of my business. to know or enquire what Books are written against my Accuser or any of his Friends and Acquaintance dead or alive. I think it very hard to publish scandalous Reports against a Presbyter, before he is either heard or examined. The Laws of Nature and Nations condemn this practice: And the Evangelical Canon requires, that *no Accusation ought to be received against an Elder, but before two or three Witnesses.*

Clandestine Libels are more Malicious than when a Man is particularly named. It is a sad Misfortune to be made the Property of every little Intelligencer. If groundless Stories, and unexamined Falshoods are publish'd for Truths, what then comes of the Peace of Human Societies? I pray God convince all Men, that are engaged in such Designs, of their Error and Injustice; and in the mean time deliver me from the Malice of such as I never provoked.

A Copy of Sir Robert Howard's Letter to me, dated the 14th. of April 1696. being an Answer to my first unprinted Letter.

SIR,

YOur Letter found me very ill in a fit of the Gout, yet I was unwilling (notwithstanding my pain) to seem so uncivil as to give you no Answer. In short, Sir, the two Treatises were sent to me, before they went to the Press, to peruse; And by reason of the kindness shew'd to me and the great abilities

abilities I saw in them; I prefix a short preface to them, having also the opportunity to say something to Mr. *Atterbury*, who, in a Sermon at *Whitehall* before the Queen, had ventur'd to treat me very ill. But when these Papers were brought, I neither knew nor was told from whom they came: But the first seems to say that you did not keep your own Secret, but that it got abroad among many that you were the Author. And the second sets down your name, and tells you at the beginning that I hardly knew his face. This, I confess, made me take it for granted that it was yours. But if it is not, which I believe upon your affirmation, I confess, I think, they ought to ask your pardon, which if ever I know them I shall invite them to do. For your Printed Paper, there is not a little in it that concerns any thing I ever knew or said. As to your Person, I am so far from having any quarrel or animosity, that I am rather sorry that this Letter should find you in restraint. I wish you all freedom and remain,

S I R,

April 13
1696.

Your humble Servant,

Ro. H O W A R D.

E I N I S.